



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

112

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/784,881	02/16/2001	Marcia L. Peters	RSW9-2001-0004-US1	5202
7590	03/31/2006			
Mark D. Simpson, Esquire Synnestvedt & Lechner 2600 Aramark Tower 1101 Market Street Philadelphia, PA 19107-2950			EXAMINER ISMAIL, SHAWKI SAIF	
			ART UNIT 2155	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 03/31/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/784,881	PETERS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Shawki S. Ismail	2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2006.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

1. This communication is responsive to the amendment (after non-final rejection) received on February 2, 2006.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13 and 16 have been amended.

Claims 1-16 are pending.

The New Grounds of Rejection

2. Applicant's amendment and arguments received on February 2, 2005 have been fully considered, however they are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. Claims 13-14, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Rice**, U.S. Patent No. **6,486,891**.

5. As to claim 13, Rice teaches a system causing a web browser to bookmark an alternate URL rather than a target URL, comprising the step of:

inserting an alternate bookmark directive as an HTML meta tag (col. 6, lines 47-52 and col. 7, lines 19-23) in an encoded web page representation associated with said target URL, said alternate bookmark directive causing said web browser to bookmark said alternate URL instead of said target URL when a user of said web browser attempts to bookmark said target URL (col. 2, lines 47-56 and col. 5, lines 31-48).

6. As to claim 14, Rice teaches a system as set forth in claim 13, wherein said encoded web page representation is encoded in HTML (col. 3, lines 19-27).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Rice**, U.S. Patent No. 6,486,891 in view of "**Official Notice**".

9. As to claim 1, 5 and 9, Rice teaches a method of causing a web browser to bookmark an alternate URL comprising the step of:

inserting an alternate bookmark directive (col. 6, lines 47-52 and col. 7, lines 19-23) in an encoded web page representation associated with said target URL, said alternate bookmark directive causing said web browser to bookmark said alternate URL

instead of said target URL when a user of said web browser attempts to bookmark said target URL (col. 2, lines 47-56 and col.5, lines 31-48),

Rice teaches the inserting alternate bookmark directives as an HTML meta tag, but does not teach the use of XML meta tags. "Official Notice" is taken that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use XML meta tags as opposed to HTML because it allows web developers and designers to create customized tags that offer greater flexibility in organizing and presenting information than is possible with the older HTML document coding system.

10. As to claim 2, 6, and 10, Rice teaches a method as set forth in claim 1, wherein said encoded web page representation is encoded in HTML (col. 3, lines 19-27).

11. Claims 3, 7, 11 and 15 do not teach or define any new limitation above claim 1; therefore, they are rejected for similar reasons.

12. Claim 4, 8, 12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Rice**, U.S Patent No. **6,486,891** and in view of **Li et al.**, (Li), U.S. Patent No. **6,631,496**.

13. As to claim 4, 8, 12 and 16, Rice teaches a method of causing a web browser to, bookmark an alternate URL comprising the step of:

inserting an alternate bookmark directive (col. 6, lines 47-52 and col. 7, lines 19-23) in an encoded web page representation associated with said target URL, said alternate bookmark directive causing said web browser to bookmark said alternate URL instead of said target URL when a user of said web browser attempts to bookmark said target URL (col. 2, lines 47-56 and col.5, lines 31-48),

Rice does not explicitly teach wherein said web browser periodically checks all URLs associated with bookmarks stored by said browser to determine if any of said URLs have an alternate bookmark directive associated therewith and, if so, causing said web browser to bookmark said alternate URL instead of the target URL

However Li teaches a hypermedia database for managing bookmarks by allowing a user to organize hypertext documents for queering, navigating, sharing and viewing. Lin further teaches periodically providing updated information for bookmarks (see abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teaching of Li into the invention of Rice in order to be able to update a bookmark. By providing such updates to bookmarks allows the browser to store the most current and up to date information about a given website.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicants argues in substance that:

(A) Argument: Rice does not teach XML or HTML meta tag

Response: Examiner agrees with the applicant that Rice does not teach XML meta tag, however, the examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant with regards to Rice not teaching HTML meta tags. Rice teaches that the web page associated with the advertisement to be bookmarked may be identified by an HREF attribute in the HTML of the advertisement or by some other means, e.g., a new or different HTML tag. Therefore, Rice teaches HTML meta tags (col. 7, lines 19-23). Although Rice does not

explicitly teach the use of XML meta tag, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use XML meta tags as opposed to HTML because it allows web developers and designers to create customized tags that offer greater flexibility in organizing and presenting information than is possible with the older HTML document coding system.

All other arguments and remarks are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shawki S Ismail whose telephone number is 571-272-3985. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shawki Ismail
Patent Examiner
March 27, 2006

Al



SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER